

VZCZCXRO8239  
PP RUEHAT  
DE RUCNDT #1082/01 3321921  
ZNR UUUUU ZZH  
P 281921Z NOV 07  
FM USMISSION USUN NEW YORK  
TO RUEHC/SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 3204  
INFO RUEHZJ/HUMAN RIGHTS COUNCIL COLLECTIVE PRIORITY  
RUEHAS/AMEMBASSY ALGIERS PRIORITY 1451  
RUEHAH/AMEMBASSY ASHGABAT PRIORITY 0064  
RUEHBK/AMEMBASSY BANGKOK PRIORITY 0571  
RUEHWN/AMEMBASSY BRIDGETOWN PRIORITY 0161  
RUEHBY/AMEMBASSY CANBERRA PRIORITY 1760  
RUEHCV/AMEMBASSY CARACAS PRIORITY 0342  
RUEHDM/AMEMBASSY DAMASCUS PRIORITY 0384  
RUEHSB/AMEMBASSY HARARE PRIORITY 0142  
RUEHKM/AMEMBASSY KAMPALA PRIORITY 0324  
RUEHKT/AMEMBASSY KATHMANDU PRIORITY 0399  
RUEHKH/AMEMBASSY KHARTOUM PRIORITY 0980  
RUEHKG/AMEMBASSY KINGSTON PRIORITY 0219  
RUEHLI/AMEMBASSY LISBON PRIORITY 0543  
RUEHSK/AMEMBASSY MINSK PRIORITY 0191  
RUEHQT/AMEMBASSY QUITO PRIORITY 0129  
RUEHGO/AMEMBASSY RANGOON PRIORITY 0213  
RUEHSJ/AMEMBASSY SAN JOSE PRIORITY 0193  
RUEHGP/AMEMBASSY SINGAPORE PRIORITY 1926  
RUEHNT/AMEMBASSY TASHKENT PRIORITY 0103  
RUEHTRO/AMEMBASSY TRIPOLI PRIORITY  
RUEHWL/AMEMBASSY WELLINGTON PRIORITY 2789

UNCLAS SECTION 01 OF 03 USUN NEW YORK 001082

SIPDIS

SIPDIS

E.O. 12958: N/A

TAGS: [UNGA](#) [PHUM](#) [IR](#) [KN](#) [BM](#) [BO](#)

SUBJECT: COUNTRY-SPECIFIC HUMAN RIGHTS RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED  
BY THE UNGA THIRD COMMITTEE

REF: A. SECSTATE 157026  
[1](#)B. SECSTATE 157024  
[1](#)C. SECSTATE 157022  
[1](#)D. SECSTATE 157020  
[1](#)E. SECSTATE 145641

USUN NEW Y 00001082 001.2 OF 003

[1](#)1. SUMMARY: On November 20-21, the Third Committee of the UN General Assembly adopted four country-specific resolutions addressing the human rights situations in North Korea, Burma, Iran and Belarus, despite attempts to derail the process through no-action motions on the last three resolutions. Many members of the Group of 77 expressed dissatisfaction with the introduction of country-specific resolutions in the Third Committee, arguing the Human Rights Council in Geneva is the appropriate venue for addressing specific human rights situations. While the voting margins for the four resolutions themselves and against the no-action motion on Burma were fairly solid, the narrow margins by which the no-action motions on Iran and Belarus were defeated give cause for concern. We are making efforts to shore up or increase these margins when the resolutions are considered in plenary

Session of the General Assembly. END SUMMARY

HUMAN RIGHTS COUNCIL VS. UNGA THIRD COMMITTEE

[1](#)2. At the outset Cuba, South Africa, Uganda, Libya, Syria, Sudan, and Nicaragua delivered general statements expressing opposition to the introduction of country-specific resolutions in the Third Committee. They called such

resolutions politicized, selective, and based on double standards and said the Human Rights Council (HRC) is the appropriate venue for addressing human rights concerns, particularly through its new Universal Periodic Review (UPR) mechanism. Speaking in support of addressing human rights issues in the Third Committee were the EU, the United States, and Australia.

#### HUMAN RIGHTS IN NORTH KOREA

¶3. The resolution on the human rights situation in North Korea (DPRK) was the first on the agenda. After statements by the main sponsors--the EU and Japan--the DPRK responded that the resolution was part of a campaign against his country by the EU and United States, whom he accused of committing human rights violations of their own, including the invasion of Iraq and "massacre of civilians" there. Costa Rica, Venezuela, Ecuador, Nepal, Belarus, Egypt, Malaysia, Algeria, China, Indonesia and Cuba all spoke against the use of country-specific resolutions in the Third Committee. There was no proposal for a "no-action" vote, however, and the resolution was adopted 97(US)-23-60.

#### HUMAN RIGHTS IN BURMA

¶4. The committee then turned to the EU resolution on Burma, whose delegate immediately moved for adjournment of the debate, i.e. for taking no action on the resolution. As is customary, two countries (China and Angola) spoke in favor of this motion and two (Norway and New Zealand) spoke against it. The no-action motion failed 54-88(US)-34. Burma argued that the resolution was an attempt to derail "Burma's roadmap to peace" at a time when Burma was cooperating with the UN. Algeria, the DPRK, Uzbekistan, Venezuela, Barbados,

USUN NEW Y 00001082 002.2 OF 003

Belarus, Egypt, Malaysia, Sudan, India, Singapore, and Cuba all spoke against the use of country-specific resolutions to address human rights concerns in the Third Committee. Thailand, the Philippines, Japan and Bangladesh noted positive steps taken by the government of Burma. Indonesia expressed regret that more efforts had not been made to seek a consensus text with the government of Burma. The resolution was adopted 88(US)-24-66. Burma announced it will not be bound by its provisions.

#### HUMAN RIGHTS IN IRAN

¶5. When the committee turned next to Canada's resolution on the human rights situation in Iran, the Iranian delegate immediately called for an adjournment of debate, noting that the HRC is the UN body entrusted to address such issues. Pakistan and Venezuela spoke in favor of the no-action motion, while Liechtenstein and Canada spoke against. The motion was narrowly rejected 78-79(US)-24. The procedural ploy having failed, Iran argued that Canada was abusing the UN human rights mechanism for political interests and criticized Canada's own human rights record. Syria, Belarus, Pakistan, Sudan, Egypt, Venezuela, Libya, Algeria, and Cuba all expressed opposition to the resolution and expressed support for dealing with these issues in the HRC, and specifically through its Universal Periodic Review mechanism. The resolution was adopted 72(US)-50-55. Brazil said it had abstained in the voting, despite concern for human rights in Iran, due to its support for consolidation of the Human Rights Council as the main UN human rights body.

#### HUMAN RIGHTS IN BELARUS

¶6. Ambassador Grover Joseph Rees, Acting U.S. Representative to the UN Economic and Social Council, introduced the Belarus resolution for the United States. Russia, arguing the resolution undermined the HRC and was "completely inappropriate," moved for adjournment of debate. China and Cuba spoke in favor while Portugal and the EU spoke against, but the motion was rejected 65-79(US)-31. Uzbekistan,

Venezuela, Russia, Syria, Zimbabwe, Turkmenistan, Iran, Sudan, DPRK, Belarus, Burma, Egypt, Jamaica and Algeria all spoke against the use of country-specific resolutions in the Third Committee and in support of the HRC. The resolution was adopted 68(US)-32-76. Ukraine said it had voted in favor of the resolution in the interest of development and cooperation with Belarus and also expressed its opposition to no-action motions, which the delegate argued close the possibility for debate on substantive issues. (Ambassador Rees's statement is available online at [http://www.usunnewyork.usmission.gov/press\\_releases/20071121\\_327.html](http://www.usunnewyork.usmission.gov/press_releases/20071121_327.html).)

#### VOTING RESULTS

¶7. The results of the voting on the resolutions were as follows (yes-no-abstain):

Draft resolution on North Korea: 97(US)-23-60.

No-action motion on Burma: 54-88(US)-34.

Draft resolution on Burma: 88(US)-24-66.

No-action motion on Iran: 78-79(US)-24.

Draft resolution on Iran: 72(US)-50-55.

No-action motion on Belarus: 65-79(US)-31.

USUN NEW Y 00001082 003.2 OF 003

Draft Resolution on Belarus: 68(US)-32-76.

#### COMMENT

¶8. Opponents of the resolutions will now try to defeat them when the General Assembly plenary reviews the report of the Third Committee, which will likely occur during the week of Dec. 10. While the voting margins for the four resolutions themselves and against the no-action motion on Burma are fairly solid, the narrow margins by which the no-action motions on Iran and Belarus were defeated give cause for concern and we have already begun making efforts to shore up or increase these margins when the resolutions are considered in plenary session of the General Assembly.  
Khalilzad